

Park & Recreation Commission Larz Anderson Skating Rink Task Force Meeting Minutes
10/4/21

Park and Recreation Commission	Meeting Minutes
--------------------------------	-----------------

Date: October 4, 2021, 6:00 PM

Place: Zoom Webinar

Commissioners Attending: John Bain, Nancy O'Connor, Wendy Sheridan, and Jim Carroll

Commissioners Absent: Antonia Bellalta

Task Force Members Attending: Jeff Thibault, Avi Urbas, Priscilla Karnovsky, Julie Jette and David Driscoll

Task Force Members Absent:

Staff: Alexandra Vecchio: Parks and Open Space Director, Jessica White: Parks and Open Space Assistant, Leigh Jackson: Recreation Director, Tyler Radicioni: Recreation Resource Manager, Jon Lewitus: Assistant Director of Recreation

TOPIC	KEY POINTS/DISCUSSION
Welcome and Introductions and approval of the minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Vecchio opened the meeting. A. Vecchio detailed the agenda. The members of the task force introduced themselves. Staff members introduced themselves
Task Force Role and Project Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Vecchio discussed the role of the ice rink task force. The project timeline was detailed. A. Vecchio wanted to reiterate that the goals for the feasibility study are not to create a final design for an ice rink in Brookline, it is really to select a site and a preferred concept. So whether that be an open-air rink, a covered rink, indoor rink, or some combination thereof. She stated that we need to think about the potential year-round programming and community use for that space, and to think about the necessary amenities to support that programming, understand and define the neighborhood impacts, and how to mitigate those impacts. A. Vecchio detailed what would go into the summary report. She stated that this is the very beginning of a long road and that this is not the only time that you will be seeing any of these design options, should we find the funding and ability to move forward with a design of a new ice rink. A. Vecchio stated that in November we will be presenting the recommendations to the full Park and Recreation Commission.
Community Meeting Recap #2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> J. Ng addressed the Commission. She stated that it was a great meeting on August 19th. There were 6 options shown. The community is

	<p>interested in an outdoor rink with a connection to nature and views, as well as, a covered rink with support facilities for both rinks. There was a lot of written feedback after the meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a preference for Option 4, Terrace. The backup preference is Option 1, NextGen. • There was interest in the year-round use of the facility and how it can give back to the community of Brookline. • Most were pleased that the options to preserve and restore open space at the historic Italianate Garden. • There was a preference to not have parking or additional vehicular access on the Boston side of the park and to provide more information on vehicular traffic, dropoff, parking, costs, and safety. <p>A recap of polling results from the following question was detailed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which Design Option was your favorite? • What should we consider as we continue these studies? 	
<p>Larz Anderson Design Option Updates</p>	<p>Summary of Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARKING AND CIRCULATION • ALL-YEAR PROGRAMMING • DESIGN OPTION “A” - TERRACE • DESIGN OPTION “B” - NEXTGEN • PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE • PERMITTING <p>Transportation Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High-level evaluation to provide a starting point for identifying Impacts • Evaluated for “ Peak Hours”= the hour of the day that generates the most activity to/from the site • Measure “Vehicle Trips”= Number of cars entering and exiting site during the peak hour • Calculated based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip generation manual. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Methodology that was looked at when evaluating trip generation to a site takes into account: land use, building square footage, number of the rink- weekday weekend number of vehicles to/from the site in peak hour.• Results of the initial analysis were shown.• Vehicles entering and exiting the site may double.• Increase from one to two rinks• Peak Hours• Public skate• Team practices• Ice mite and House League• Not all trips have to be vehicle trips. For example, the use of busses would reduce the number of vehicles coming to this site.• N. Raffol stated that this analysis falls in the line with what would be expected after talking to the Task Force and getting feedback on usage of the rink. She stated that right now the existing rink is sufficiently meeting its demand in terms of the number of trips to this site. She stated that the team looked at the peak hours based on the existing user that has the highest activity. Examples of this high usage activity were discussed. These numbers are the first pass and were given to provide a starting point for the conversation. <p>Circulation and Connectivity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An example of the terrace option was shown. This shows an example of how the existing circulation would be maintained with cars entering from Newton Street and exiting on Avon Street. The entry into both new parking areas would be one way. There are designated drop-off areas adjacent to the new facility and the optional bus layover area.• An illustration of alternate parking locations in Larz Anderson that are within a five-minute walk was shown. She stated that with the trail project, which is refurbishing the existing path and proposing a path along the driveway into the site and past the rink, there would be improved pedestrian access. This would help	
--	---	--

	<p>overall circulation and connectivity within the site to and from the rink.</p> <p>Existing parking supply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lined in yellow is the primary site parking and that is 49 spaces.• The secondary site parking is shown in blue, it is the parking to the north of the loop and has parallel spaces along the driveway up to Avon which totals 27 spaces.• Off-Site parking is shown in purple, near the Baseball diamonds and along Goddard Ave which totals 73 spaces.• There is a total of 149 spaces within a 5-minute walk of the site. <p>Future Parking Supply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Existing primary parking is increasing from 49 to 96 spaces- reconfiguring the existing lot adjacent to the site and creating a new parking lot to the south of the facility which adds spaces. There would be trails to make access to and from other parking areas to the facility easier and safer.• Examples of parking evaluations based on zoning code were illustrated. How peak hours were calculated was discussed. <p>All year programming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An example of a 12-month calendar was shared.• Program scale studies= field sports• Illustrations of conversions to the below field sports were shown.<ul style="list-style-type: none">Standard ice rinkIndoor lacrosse fieldIndoor field hockeyIndoor soccer field• R. Lieberg stated that conversion discussion happens regardless of whether it is outdoor or covered. He stated that the concrete slab that is refrigerated for the ice, once melted, service temporarily gets warmed up and can be used for other things. It can be temporarily striped, any turf can be brought out and joined. He stated that all sports would have markings on the turf if they called for them. Temporary paint can be	
--	--	--

	<p>laid out or covered. R. Lieberg discussed dasher boards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Examples of what a volleyball court, tennis court, pickleball layout were shown. KMDG took a pass at laying out various configurations. KMDG took a pass of laying out archery, which was shown in an illustration. This would be set up like bowling lanes. J. Ng stated that we did not include scale comparisons for splash pads, they are more complicated and involve a lot of sloping and technical details. If it was something the town wanted KMDG to look at, they would but it would impact the cost estimated.• A. Urbas thinks it's great that we're looking at the number of potential visitors especially given the feedback heard from the community about how that might impact traffic. However, from what he sees in terms of park usages, he believes it's typically about half of what he has heard described here tonight. He would like to be cautious given the valid and appropriate concerns, but at the same time not have an abundance of caution and overestimation to a point that is higher than we have typically observed. He thinks that one of the easiest ways to accommodate that is to understand that this is a planning and a feasibility exercise, we're not designing the facility that's going to be there. He thinks that it is important that it is set up so that the seating can be expanded if it's needed.• N. O'Connor stated that to A. Urbas's point, she feels the same way. She stated that she had her kids playing up at Larz and now her grandkids play there. She feels that nothing has changed in terms of the numbers through the years. She stated that youth programs have 12-14 kids and it is mostly for practice. She stated that Brookline High School was playing at Boston University. N. O'Connor stated that busses are not a common thing, there are no busloads of kids coming to play on the rink. She is curious about the impact and how that works if it's a slab, specifically shock resiliency. R. Lieberg stated that it is not a roll of indoor/outdoor carpet. It is a material that has a cushion	
--	--	--

	<p>backing. It would be the thick carpet with a thick pad.</p> <p>Design Option A: Terrace</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Covered rink with an open rink split by support facilities• An updated parking configuration was shown. KMDG heard from Boston residents, that there was a desire to have more of a buffer. This buffer is between Park and Avon Street and was represented by trees in the illustration. J. Ng stated that we heard questions and concerns around safety. There is a dedicated sidewalk shown in grey, some accessible access to the Avon Street driveway recognizing that people are parking at the top of the sledding hill. She stated that she wanted to give access to these rinks along Avon Street without having to go all the way around. She wanted to point out the strategy of nestling the rinks. She stated that they are trying to balance cut and fill as much as possible.• R. Lieberg stated that if you recall from previous descriptions, the section illustrations that were just shown depict the idea of the Terrace as a two-level facility. The upper level, for the most part, supports the pleasure rink side of things, and the lower level for the most part supports the main rink or the covered rink side of things. They are joined by a vestibule that allows people to come into the rink, or to the facility. The main point of all of this is to have a welcoming open space that can be used for a variety of events that can be used in the offseason and used during the season as a gathering space. He stated that you could think of it as a warming house at a typical rink brought inside a larger facility. He stated that on the lower level, there are mechanical rooms for the refrigeration equipment, locker rooms, which would have access to the main ice sheet and a little bit of gathering space.• R. Lieberg stated that we are showing some images that suggest some design, and it's less about designing the building and much more about how this facility can interact with the site. He stated that we're not suggesting that these are the designs for the buildings but rather	
--	---	--

representations of how the size and the amount of space that's needed look when you put it into a building chunk. He stated that this happens to be a little more of a contemporary type of building shape, and the next image will have a little more of a traditional building shape.

Design Option B* - Nextgen

- He stated that what you see in this design on the outside is very similar to the same Terrace options. KMDG heard the same comments about parking, buffers, circulation/vehicular circulation for this design.
- He stated that this option puts everything at the same level as what it is now, so what you see is a section that is cutting crosswise, and you see this sort of really big wall. There is a long section and you can see that they are adding a lot of filler, dirt, and walls, to keep everything at the same level.
- He stated that there are advantages to being at the same level, unlike the previous design which had two stories to the building. The minor exception to that is a bit of disconnect. The lobby piece that is at the bottom of the page allows people to come in at a slightly lower level and go up a few stairs or take an elevator to get into the main body. All the program items that were talked about in the previous design are all represented here on one level, with the pleasure rink being in the same spot, and then that covered main ice rink is to the right of the plan. Orientation wise it's very similar, but it's all on one level. In this illustration, to make two things happen at that one level, there is a considerable amount of fill and high walls that would be needed underneath the main covered rink. There are absolutely ways with architecture and with landscaping features to mitigate this, so it doesn't look like a big flat wall, but the bottom line is there will still be a wall there. He stated that one of the things that they started looking at is how to slope the grade.
- KMDG is still reviewing some of the grants that have guidelines for Larz Anderson.
- The permitting review process for the project was discussed.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary cost estimate does not include soft costs • The cost estimates for the Terrace and Nextgen Option were detailed. • R. Lieberg stated that building costs are similar between the two options, in the sense that the square footage between the two is very wise. The big difference is the landscape work. KMDG is still evaluating costs. They just wanted to provide a high-level analysis. <p>Utilities to consider</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electricity, gas, and water • Utility cost varies between covered and enclosed • Operations • Staff, equipment, maintenance, and marketing • Operation costs (minus utilities) will be similar regardless of the type of rink • As part of the final feasibility study KMDG will certainly work up numbers that are geared towards this specifically chosen site, and building configuration. 	
<p>Putterham Alternative Site Analysis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A site analysis of Putterham was detailed. The topography was discussed. • Putterham site images were shown. • M. Klopfer stated that this certainly is a difficult site in a lot of ways. He stated that the site was chosen by the Task Force and so KMDG looked at what is possible to do there. • He stated that we took the two schemes that were looked at for Larz Anderson, and placed them on the Putterham site, just as a starting point, there might be better configurations or ways to rotate the rinks and that's something that was looked at as well. This is just a starting point for today's conversation. A similar parking count was shown here. This first scheme shown was the Terrace, with two different elevations, so it's sited where it is so that it's outside of the buffer zone. The building itself was shown and a dashed black line that goes around the building is seen as the likely zone of influence of construction. He stated that there might have to be clearing and grading work. He stated that it is possible to add a loop 	

road which was shown in red. It would connect Hammond Parkway back to Newton Street as an opportunity for having circulation be connected to two different streets rather than being connected to just one. He thinks in the first analysis it made sense to just keep both schemes at the one end of the site, to keep the impact the lowest. There is the possibility that the driveway could exist and that could also serve as some parking as well. There are different ways to configure this, but they found that this was the most compact and the most efficient way to do it. It requires a little bit of cut into the slope and it also maximizes the buffer between the fire training area and the sort of rink campus. This overall reduces the woodland by about 25%.

- M. Klopfer stated that some of the spaces that are currently existing in the kind of dogleg of the municipal lot would likely be removed just to have the circulation work for the parking lot. There will be some adjustments to the existing number of spaces. There is some sort of efficiency in having all the parking for both uses be ganged together on this side of the site. Other than that the plan is exactly as R. Lieberg just explained it. It would have an ice sheet on one side, a pleasure rink on the other and it's going to be sitting in trees so there's doesn't have the same notion of view that you have at Larz Anderson.
- M. Klopfer stated that the second scheme just shows an enclosed rink or a covered rink. It also works in the same way, is placed on-site the same way, and has the potential of still having a driveway in the same way. The parking lot is slightly reconfigured to be more efficient in terms of how compact it is and there is a landscape island. This uses the existing municipal golf course entrance and exit to the site like the previous one did. He stated that by tightening up the parking and the building and having one rink here, they were able to reduce the woodland by 20% rather than 25% in this scheme. This scheme called for a slightly bigger buffer to the road. This scheme also requires a little bit of cut to make the existing driveway

	<p>and parking lots work and so forth so there would be some cut-in and rock work involved with that.</p> <p>The detail of scheme 2 was shown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enclosed Building Opportunities • Reduced footprint • Tucked away, out of sight • Sustainability Opportunities • More air quality control relative to the fire training campus • More control over the calendar and extended skating season • Parking can be maximized during the Golf Course's offseason. • Building footprint is out of the 200' buffer zone. <p>Summary of next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and Parking analysis • Cost Analysis • J. Ng stated that we heard a lot of written and verbal feedback in some of the previous meetings regarding the Putterham woods site. She knows there is a preference for Larz. The permitting process is the same due to the change in use on-site regardless of whether it is a covered rink or an enclosed range. The decision to proceed with a covered or enclosed rink is not a permitting decision, it is a cost and experience decision. 	
Community Polling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Concepts- Community polling • Which Larz Anderson option do you prefer? • Which Putterham Design option do you prefer? 	
Community Discussion and Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R. Lieberg stated that an enclosed rink could certainly take the place of the canopy option, and it could be worked in. • N. O' Connor stated that from the polls this enclosed rink is the preference. She stated that one of the things that we have not looked into and discussed are the permitting and article 97 issues. She thinks that to be voting on something that we do not have a full picture of is unfortunate. J. Ng stated that we have started that permitting conversation with lawyers, and they have a very detailed spreadsheet that they are happy to share with the Task Force. She 	

	<p>stated that the important thing to know is that whether you decide to go with an enclosed rink or a covered rink, the permitting path is the same for Putterham Woods and Larz Anderson. The two sites have separate permitting paths, but as it is contained to each site and is the same regardless of what you put on there. N. O'Connor is concerned that triggering too much is going to put this project many years out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Julie Jette asked if any expansion of the current warming hut at Larz would trigger Article 97. J. Ng stated that there are a few different permits at the state level and Larz and Putterham Woods would trigger different state-level permits. M. Klopfer stated that it has to do with the square footage of building space within a designated open space. There is more work to be done with the process in the ongoing investigation on that side of the feasibility study.• W. Sheridan would suggest that we do not speculate. She stated that in regards to the various configurations when it comes to whether or not one of these things is covered or fully enclosed, that will be a decision that we will come to later in the process when we have more information to make it. She stated that right now we're in feasibility, not a total design of this space, and there will be an entirely new design review process that will go into all the fine details of the project. W. Sheridan likes design A, the Terrace design at Larz Anderson. She likes how it sort of melts into a landscape in a way that she finds to be the least obtrusive to the park. She is thrilled that there would be increased recreational opportunities at that space, and although the design gives you a fairly good representation of what it might look like, she wanted to point out that they are still harsh drawings. She feels that there will be a lot of soft edges to those buildings. She is concerned with the Nextgen design and the size of the retaining wall. She feels like The Terrace option provides the best opportunity for the town.• N. O'Connor prefers option A over option B and thinks option B is too jarring. She liked the idea offering the gardens for future design	
--	---	--

	<p>opportunities. She is not completely attached to the second ice rink. She has spent a lot of time at Larz and from the ice surface, you cannot see Boston. She stated that you have to walk up an inaccessible hill to the balustrade to look over at the Boston Skyline. She likes option A terrace, and she likes it at Larz.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• J. Carroll stated that the design team had put the usage up for participants, but then all the comments that were made stated that it is far less of a participation rate by the public than presented. He was hoping for some type of return of investment here. He was hoping that a larger rink will open up more participation from other teams, rather than a smaller rink• J. Bain prefers the building on B. It looks like a much better setup and layout as far as the general public goes. He likes option A for many reasons, but he would like the building and locker room area in B to be in A.• Urbas stated that it is really helpful to see the slope issues and the additional costs. He thinks that it would be a great reason to go with the Terrace Option if it solves that problem. He is pretty sure he heard in a previous meeting that the Terrace, option A, was going to have a smaller pleasure rink than the current footprint. He stated that going back to the charge of the Task Force, it was to find ice, ice time, and availability. He stated that as long as the pleasure rink is the same size as the covered/ enclosed rink, he would be in support of either option. He would not support an option for a smaller outdoor pleasure rink because he thinks it just limits us unnecessarily if we're going to be making that investment. He was pleased to hear that the permitting pathway is the same for covered versus enclosed. He stated that enclosed solves a problem that covered doesn't, which is availability due to temperatures. He stated that we talked about how covered could help us in terms of rain or snow, but in his experience with Larz, the temperature is the biggest barrier to availability. He believes that J. Carroll said in a previous meeting if we're going for a big opportunity here we need to solve the indoor option and he thinks from the	
--	--	--

	<p>feedback that he has been hearing from the hockey community, an indoor rink is necessary. He would like the Task Force to look at the enclosed option. He stated that the difference in price between covered and enclosed over 30 years when you bond or borrow is not significant enough to overcome the lack of uptime. He stated that on the Putterham side he is not in favor of anything that would have us taking down trees and nature area for a rink. He doesn't think that makes sense and that was reiterated pretty loud and clear in the feedback in the letters. He stated that the Task Force did talk a little bit about the option of looking at available additional space from the golf course and it just hasn't been clear to him how that process gets worked through. He stated that it is a huge recreation space already and he would love to see that if Putterham is being considered. Larz is a preferable site from his standpoint anyway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Julie Jette is happy that A. Urbas brought up the size of the open rink because that was a concern of hers also. She thinks having them the same size is important. She thinks that option A is a more attractive option from both a cost and impact to the site standpoint. She does remember concerns about sharing equipment between the two rinks. She does not think that any of the options work at the Putterham location. She thinks the topography would be too challenging, but as A. Urbas mentioned she is interested in looking at the entirety of that area that was talked about.• Priscilla Karnovsky wanted to echo exactly what A. Urbas said. She stated that in regards to the Putterham site the intention was never to invade the Putterham Woods and the passive existence of everything that is but to see if there is a creative way to look at Putterham in its entirety.• A. Vecchio stated that a couple of folks in the Q&A asked if Putterham Woods were pursued as a single indoor rink option, would that necessitate the closure of the existing large outdoor rink. A. Vecchio stated that for the outdoor rink to remain functional it would need	
--	--	--

	<p>some upgrades. It is currently running on temporary refrigeration units so it is not feasible for that to continue in its current state in the long haul. She thinks that we would need to understand if that was 1. Something that the community wanted to keep open and 2. What would be the cost for us to do that which would be outside the scope of this current study for feasibility study purposes. The short answer is we don't know at this point. But no matter what a further investment would be needed if we chose to keep that rink open and functioning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Michael Berger addressed the Task Force. He wanted to thank everyone for the presentation. He is a town meeting member from Precinct 15, and a former Park and Recreation Commissioner. His son was a young hockey player up at Larz, and it was canceled sometimes because of weather, so having another site that was enclosed is something that he and his family has always wanted. He was struck by the difference between the treatments of the two sites. He thought that the treatment of Larz comparatively to Putterham was sensitive to the landscape at large, and how it fits in. He asked if you were to build a kind of a shed between the two rinks or some kind of cover, he wonders if you obstruct the view that you have from the rink. He thinks part of the allure of skating open air at Larz is being able to see greater Boston. He would want that to be taken into consideration. In Putterham he was just struck by how different the analysis was. He stated that there are pretty rocks there, but there's a lot of beautiful open space, and trees that have been neglected. He believes there are capital improvements plans for that area as well plans to connect that area with the golf course to essentially increase the amount of open space. He stated that Horace James Circle is right there which creates a terrible traffic congestion spot.• A. Vecchio stated that an attendee asked if there is a way to quantify the risk or lack thereof of ice functionality in a covered versus fully enclosed scenario and wonders if the current issues and risks can be mitigated with proper, modern cooling equipment in a covered outdoor	
--	--	--

facility. R. Lieberg stated that the main thing to consider is that keeping the direct precipitation off of the rink is a major help, whether that be snow or rain. He stated that keeping falling leaves and that sort of thing off the ice is also important. He stated that the final design of a canopy option would take into account sun angles, prevailing winds, and all of the factors that would be deficiencies in the performance of a true outdoor rink.

- Don Haber addressed the Task Force. He has lived across the street from Larz Anderson Park since 1994 and has been a member of the Friends of Larz Anderson Park for many years. He has a great interest in this as do his neighbors, and he has attended almost all of these meetings since this came together. One of the things that he wanted to point out in both Option A and Option B, is the placement of the fan stands for parents and spectators and generally the location of the hockey rink and the recreational rink. He stated that if you look at the diagrams the stands are along the side of the building, and they face directly towards the closest neighbors. He stated that if it is a covered rink, he would imagine that the noise is going to be reflected then off of the ice, the back of the building and the roof, and even more projected directly at the neighbors. He wanted to know if it has been brought up at all. He asked if there has been considered by the architects and the Task Force on reversing the position of the two rinks so that the noise is not being projected at the neighbors. R. Lieberg stated we are trying to put a whole bunch of things together in a pretty small area, and deal with some existing elevations and other constraints. He stated that the orientations and placement of these bits and pieces are pretty well constrained. The decision to put the seating where it is was is to be able to have those patrons take advantage of the services inside the building. The placement of the competition rink/the main covered rink was intentionally placed lower so that the higher roof elevation was again mitigated slightly by the Terrace effect. The second reason was that the pleasure

	<p>rink was envisioned in this Terrace design as something that sort of bridged the gap between the Italianate gardens, the wide-open, planted, nature-type area to the open sort of freedom of a pleasure rink, with the more active piece down below. M. Klopfer stated that the building needs to be sort of where it is to be the center of the complex so people are arriving there from both parking lots. It would be possible to do that but then everybody has to walk that much longer. D. Haber stated that he was asking about flipping the rinks not changing the location of the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A. Vecchio stated that there are a couple of questions regarding the Italianate garden in the Q&A. She stated that the restoration of the Italian Gardens is not within the scope of this study, what is being shown on these plans is a possibility. She stated that restoring the architectural remains around the Italianate gardens is in the long-term plans for Larz Anderson. She stated that it could just be an additional green space for the public to enjoy.. Those pieces are included as a way to help kind of contextualize the space and understand the surroundings.• Mary Stuart addressed the Taskforce. She is interested in this phase of the development and seeing the two different sites, but also the possibility of having a new covered rink, or enclosed rink at the Putterham Golf Course and leaving the Larz Anderson space as is. She has been working on the gift of Isabel Anderson to the Town of Brookline since 1988. She believes that Italianate Gardens was taken out in the 50s, and replaced by a skating rink and a hut. She stated that we talked about alternate uses in the summer, but the Recreation Department wasn't able to pull off any consistent programming there at the time. She thinks that keeping the Italian garden space for outdoor recreational skating would be fine and then to have the covered rink or any recreational facility in a much bigger space that can handle this kind of facility other than Larz Anderson, which is a historic landscape. She feels very strongly that	
--	--	--

	<p>the existing rink should be restored so that people can skate there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• S. Batchelor addressed the task force. He stated that he polled the Friends of Larz Anderson mailing list about a month ago and received 10 replies. He stated that there was strong support for the Terrace option at Larz. There was strong support for restoring the garden. He stated that the traffic concerns were addressed today. He stated that Don Haber spoke about the noise. He would suggest a simpler solution for noise is to enclose the rink. He was not surprised by the strength of the positions against Putterham, which we've heard some of today and he thinks it's a terrible idea. He suggested looking at Skyline Drive and hopes that the Putterham option is removed from the table.• P. T. Vineburgh addressed the Task Force. He wanted to say thank you to everyone for their hard work. He is a new Brookline resident and a parent of three young children who all love playing hockey. He thinks Brookline is long overdue to have a newer facility. He loves option A: the Terrace option. He stated that Avi Urbas was correct in his thinking when he was talking about the incremental increase in cost to do a fully enclosed rink and the versatility that gives you over time. He is very appreciative of everyone's efforts and is looking forward to seeing this progress. He wanted to point out that from a traffic standpoint it would be great to get some sort of context to be able to offer when talking about this stuff. He thinks that in the grand scheme of things, traffic usage is pretty light. He discussed the Wellesley Rink. He wants to be sensitive to the immediate abutters and those that live nearby. He thinks that it is important as people evaluate this because he thinks it is less of a concern.• A. Vecchio stated that there is a question in the Q&A about the many kids learning on ice that currently exists that is adjacent to the main rink. The attendee would like to know whether or not that is being included in these further options. <p>R. Lieberg stated that the attempt was to provide some kind of space for that.</p>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Andrea Howley addressed the Taskforce. She stated the last gentleman who spoke about the Wellesley rink may be onto something, but she just doesn't think that Larz Anderson is the place for something like that. She thinks that it would take another area to do a big complex like that, with a good amount of parking. She has taken children out to that complex. She would suggest if the final selection for both rinks is at Larz Anderson, that the one that's a competitive rink be closed for the neighbor's sanity. She grew up skating in that rink so it brings back fond memories, but if you're going to hear the competitive cheering, etc, she would like to see it enclosed. She does think that the biggest concern from the Boston neighbors surrounding moves in the distance, is the amount of traffic that's going to be stimulated by all of this. She wonders what the plans are to try to help mitigate that.• Peter Senopoulos addressed the Task Force. He thanked everyone for their time and efforts. He has lived on Hopkins Road for over 60 years. He is a Board member of the Jamaica Hills Association. The JHA sent a letter to the Task Force regarding their traffic concerns on Center Street. He stated that they are inundated with traffic on both Pond and Center Street. Their concern is the additional traffic congestion in that corner of Larz Anderson Park and on Pond and Avon Street. He is concerned about where the traffic is going to go.• Bob Allen addressed the task force. He has been involved in a number of these projects in the town. He stated that Brookline Youth Hockey has over 400 kids and they are struggling to find ice time. He thinks an enclosed rink would have a major positive impact on Brookline Youth Hockey. He stated that this is a feasibility study so it's important to keep a lot of a lot of these ideas on the table right now. He stated that right now it's all about what is possible and affordable. He stated that we can make this project work, and feels that the Town of Brookline should finance this project. He stated that we can figure the traffic issues out. He stated that Brookline youth	
--	---	--

Park & Recreation Commission Larz Anderson Skating Rink Task Force Meeting Minutes
10/4/21

	<p>hockey is willing to work with the town in any way they can.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J. Bain stated that we have heard a lot of negative comments about Putterham Woods and he would like to suggest that on the next agenda that the Task Force decides whether or not to keep Putterham Woods on the table. He is one hundred percent in favor of Larz Anderson and is in favor of taking Putterham Woods off the table. • W. Sheridan stated that the next task force working group meeting is on October 14th from 4 pm-5:30 pm. W. Sheridan stated that J. Bain's request can be added to the agenda • W. Sheridan thanked everyone for being here tonight. She stated that it was nice to see such robust participation from the public. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjourn 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N. O'Connor moved to adjourn. Meeting adjourned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

- **Next Meeting: Location: Zoom Webinar**

- **A true record**

Attest Jessica White

Date: 10/4/21

Question Report

Report Generated:

10/26/2021 18:54

Actual Start Time

Question

Park and Recreation
Commission Larz Anderson
Skating Rink Task Force Public
Meeting #3

160 406 9117

10/4/2021 17:48

34

Question Details

#

Question

Asker Name

Answer(s)

Can I ask when that study was conducted? (The
1. peak traffic numbers
2. Which hours are considered "peak hours?"
Does the Larz Anderson Auto Museum patrons
parking included within existing available parking
3 count?

Gary Lowe
Don Haber

At this stage, no vehicle count has occurred. This is based off usage to date and qualitative observations. There would need to be additional analysis done after the feasibility study is complete and we move into design.
live answered

How will people walk the 5 minutes from the
playground parking lot to the ice rink facility in
the winter when the pathway around the
4 perimeter of the park is not plowed?
5 Thank you

Anonymous Attendee
Don Haber
Gary Lowe

No
Access from parking lot(s) to the ice rink facility will be further refined if /when we move into the design process.
live answered

Do you mind orienting us with regard to
east/west. For sun exposure and specifically
6 sunset...
Why not make the lower rink indoors? Year
7 round skating would benefit all residents.

Gary Lowe
Dan O'Connor

Thank you, Dan. We have captured that feedback. The indoor vs covered design decision is still in flux as you can tell from the presentation.

Did you get an estimate of recurring maintenance
8 costs for enclosed rink vs open rink?

John O'Brien

That has not been incorporated as of yet.

Part of the beauty of recreational skating on the
top of Larz is the view of Boston. Will the canopy
in the covered rink or the NextGen shed obscure
9 the view from the rink?
Is there a color coded photo of the Larz
10 elevations? That would be helpful.

Michael Berger
Don Haber

No. But this can be even further refined when (and if) we move into design.
We don't have one in this presentation but I can share the topography map with you for Larz Anderson site if that is of interest.

Are you taking comments from the public today?
if Putterham woods were pursued (single indoor
rink option), would that necessitate closure of the
12 existing Lars outdoor rink?

Michael Berger
P.T. Vineburgh

Yes. After the polling is complete

Your poll doesn't make sense option 3 should be
13 please focus on putterham
do these votes count for anything or are they just
14 informational?

Adrian Habet
Jeff Ward

live answered
Based on feedback from previous meetings and written comments, some folks are asking us to just focus on Larz and not include Putterham Woods in the feasibility study.
These polls inform each iteration of the feasibility study and are reviewed and discussed by the consulting team and ice rink task force.

If you do one covered rink at putterham, will you
then have a recreational open rink at larz
15 anderson?

Anonymous Attendee

live answered

while skating at the existing larz skating, one cannot see the boston skyline.

is there a way to quantify the risk (or lack thereof) of ice functionality in a covered (versus fully enclosed) scenario. Basically, are the current issues/risks with larz (usage being largely weather dependent) mitigated with proper/modern equipment in a covered/outdoor facility? P.T. Vineburgh
 Morgan Herman
 live answered
 No it does not.

Peter Senopoulos: What is the status of the traffic study and area impact for Larz Anderson option? What is the planned traffic plan/configuration for Larz? Will all the traffic be operating over the top of the Hill?
 Jane Senopoulos
 Anonymous Attendee
 This was discussed earlier in the presentation. If time permits, I will ask them to move back to this part of the slide deck. If not, all slides will be posted on the project page this week.
 Thank you for that feedback.

Design A is makes sense Wendy points out
 Anonymous Attendee
 reinstating the Italianate garden will cost alot of money in construction as well as maintenance
 Where can we send our feedback following the meeting?
 ellen franco
 Anonymous Attendee
 live answered
 avecchio@brooklinema.gov

The town clear cut the trees for the driving range...I don't see the trees as being an issue. It would be lovely to replant and be mindful of trees...but should
 Anonymous Attendee
 Thank you for that feedback

Is there a cost breakdown available for the putterham option? I understand it is behind in planning but forgoing the option in preference of Larz is difficult without the availability of similar outlooks.
 Jennifer Connett
 Not at this time. That will be presented at public meeting 4 if putterham woods remains in the feasibility study.

Question- Option Design. A. would this included a "loading / drop off area" for hockey equipment and teams?
 Anonymous Attendee
 Yes

You have to walk up to the top of the hill. Many trees are in the way
 Adrian Habet
 Thank you for that feedback. Your comments have been recorded.

The concept of restoring the Italianate garden is a strong one and seems in keeping with the original intention of the bequest to the Town. I think Option A seems to flow well with this concept.
 Anonymous Attendee
 Thank you for that feedback.

Also - is the mini kids learning rink adjacent to the main rink going away in all of these options? I don't see one anywhere. Maybe not a priority in the new design? But keeps little ones in a safer zone than a large open rink...
 Anonymous Attendee
 live answered
 The garden is not being studied in this feasibility study.

Mary Dewar made very good points, there is a lot of history at Larz Anderson that needs to be and should be preserved, protected and maintained.
 Anonymous Attendee
 Thank you for that feedback. It has been recorded.

what is the time frame for building/renovating the new rink?
 Michelle Papazian
 We don't have a time frame for construction at this stage. After we complete the feasibility study we would potentially move into a design study which would then further define the (potential) construction timeline.

I don't believe this is just about skating...There will be considerable expense involved so broadening the scope for more year round and more broad community use should be considered. Skating is the driving force, but let's not forget the open space and the original intent of the park, the views and the green space for recreational use. Striking the right balance is

31. important.

Anonymous Attendee

32. several years!

Michelle Papazian

There is a long road ahead of this project

33. Bob Allen's input during the process on any level would be a valuable asset.

Anonymous Attendee

Michelle Papazian

34. ty

